

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 13-20 are pending in the application. The Examiner has objected to Claim 1 as line 18 contains an improper period. The Examiner has rejected Claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Harris et al. (U.S. Patent 6,009,336). The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-11, 13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Hull et al. (U.S. Patent 5,806,005). The Examiner has rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Hull et al., and further in view of Gerszberg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,044,403). The Examiner has rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Hull et al. and Sugiyama et al. (U.S. Patent 5,696,315).

Regarding the objection to Claim 1 for containing an improper period, Claim 1 has been amended to remove the period in line 18. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejections of the claims, the Examiner rejects Claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Harris et al. Disclosed in Harris et al. is a hand-held radiotelephone having a detachable display. The Harris et al. device has a camera unit therein. The Examiner states that Harris et al. discloses a device having one controller as recited in the preamble of Claim 17. The device disclosed in Harris et al. supplies power to both the telephone and the camera, regardless of the operational mode. Claim 17 has been amended to clearly distinguish that the camera mode is set by turning on the camera (i.e. supplying power to the camera) during the portable phone mode. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 17 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected independent Claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Hull et al. Hull et al. discloses a wireless image transfer from a digital still video camera to a networked computer. Claims 1 and 16 each claim, among other elements, an interface between the portable phone unit and the display to display images and characters on the display. This interface is recited in these claims to selectively display

camera mode output or phone mode output, depending on current operational mode. Neither Harris et al. nor Hull et al., either alone or in combination, teach or disclose this element. Withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Hull et al. Harris et al. discloses that power is supplied to power supplies of both the first housing and the second housing at the same time. In contrast, Claims 9-11 each recite that power is supplied to different elements of the claimed device at different times and during different operating modes. Specifically, Claim 9 recites that the portable phone controller controls a battery power voltage to be supplied to the camera unit when a user turns on the camera on/off switch; Claim 10 recites that the portable phone controller controls an LCD power supply to the display unit when a user turns on the camera on/off switch; and Claim 11 recites that the portable phone controller controls an operational voltage supplied to the camera controller when the terminal is in a portable phone mode by turning off the camera on/off switch. As neither Harris et al. nor Hull et al., either alone or in combination, disclose these claim recitations, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 9-11 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects independent Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Hull et al. and Sugiyama et al. Sugiyama et al. discloses a video printer having a simplified key in operation having a scroll key to scroll through images. None of the references cited by the Examiner specifically recite entering a first E-mail transmission sub-mode upon user request for E-mail transmission while operating in a portable phone mode, the first e-mail transmission sub-mode performing a portable phone function, as recited in Claim 20 of the present application. This first sub-mode clearly distinguishes Claim 20 from the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 20 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 16, 17 and 20 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-11, 13-15, 18 and 19, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended

independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-11, 13-15, 18 and 19 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-11 and 13-20, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM